

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, claims 10 and 11 have been amended to address a §112 concern raised by the Examiner. §112 support for the Amendment may be found, for example, at page 10, lines 29-31 of the specification.

No new matter is added and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. Entry of the Amendment after final is appropriate because Applicants are merely clarifying the language of two dependent claims, and, as discussed below, the case is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-20 are pending.

In Paragraph Nos. 6-7, Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

The examiner states that Claims 10 and 11 are not commensurate in scope with Claim 1 from which they depend. Per the examiner, Claim 1 requires a tetraalkylphosphonium compound, and Claims 10 and 11 require compounds that are not encompassed by tetraalkylphosphonium compounds.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner, insofar as Claim 1 does not necessarily require a tetraalkylphosphonium compound. Instead, Claim 1 contains a proviso that, when the polymer is a polycarbonate, the organic modified layered silicate incorporated in the film contains a tetraalkylphosphonium compound or a quaternary salt of a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound.

However, in view of the proviso recited in Claim 1, Applicants have amended dependent Claims 10 and 11 for purposes of clarity. In this regard, the description at page 10, lines 29-31, makes clear that Applicants intended for tetraalkylphosphonium compounds, triphenylphosphonium compounds, tetraphenylphosphonium compounds, and quaternary salts of

nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compounds to be used either alone or as a mixture of two or more in the organic modified layered silicate. Therefore, Claims 10 and 11 are amended as seen above.

In view of the above, the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and withdraw the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 10 and 11.

In Paragraph Nos. 8-9, claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 12 and 20 of copending application no. 10/807,163 in view of Lan.

Claims 12 and 20 of copending Appln. No. 10/807,163 were canceled in an Amendment filed July 26, 2007. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

The Examiner is thus kindly requested to withdraw the rejection.

In Paragraph No. 10, claims 1-3 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 12 and 20 of the ‘163 application in view of Kaminsky.

This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 12 and 20 of the copending ‘163 application in the Amendment filed July 26, 2007. The Examiner is thus kindly requested to withdraw the present rejection.

In paragraph 11 of the Action, claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the above responses, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-7 are allowable in their present form.

Allowance is respectfully requested.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brett S. Sylvester/

Brett S. Sylvester
Registration No. 32,765

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 3, 2007